REMARKS

The Office Action of September 8, 2004 has been received and its contents carefully considered. The Examiner's withdrawal of the final Action of August 7, 2003, is gratefully acknowledged.

Claims 1-20 are pending in this application. Claim 1, 15 and 18 are independent claims.

In the present Action, claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Kotani* et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,101,536) in view of *Wasilewski et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,341,425). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicant's independent claim 1, recites an image signal transmitting apparatus for transmitting image signals stored in an image acquiring system or storage system to an image signal receiving center for processing the image signals. The image signal transmitting apparatus includes a function selection panel, a receiving unit, a controller, and a transmitting unit. The function selection panel has a multiple key keypad for entering transmission signals by a user. The receiving unit has a transmission interface through which it receives the image signals from the image acquiring system or storage system. The controller receives the image signals from the receiving unit and the transmission signals entered by the user through the function selection panel, and controls the sending of the image signals. The transmitting unit coupled to the controller sends the image signals to the image receiving center at a remote location according to the transmission signals.

In rejecting claim 1, the Examiner acknowledges that *Kotani* does not disclose the user input being directly at the transmitting terminals. To cure this deficiency in the primary reference, *Kotani*, the Examiner points to *Wasilewski* as teaching transmission sites (22, 24, 28) each of which is provided with its own broadcast key, and a common system key. For example, at transmission site (22), the system key (40) and unique broadcast key (42) are convolved in a predetermined manner to generate a unique data encryption key for that transmission site. The Examiner argues that it would have been obvious to one having skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify *Kotani's* system of image transmission to include *Wasilewski's*

encrypted keys at the transmission site. Specifically, the Examiner asserts that one would have been motivated in view of the suggestion in *Wasilewski et al.* that encrypted keys at the transmission site can be used as a user input at the transmitting site.

What *Wasilewski* discloses is that each transmission site is provided with a system key "SK" (40) comprising a first number S of bits and a broadcast key "BK" (42, 44, 48) comprising a second number B of bits, which are convolved at the transmission site to generate an encryption key comprising a third number E of bits (Col. 5, lines 4-6 and 41-44). The system key and the broadcast key may be transmitted to each respective transmission site from a remote location or may be pre-stored at the transmission sites (Col. 5, lines 13-17). Further, *Wasilewski* discloses that the system key "SK" (40) and each broadcast key "BK" (42, 44, 48) are also stored in memory (60) at the reception site (30). The encryption key generated by the convolving means (50) does not have to be stored at the reception site, so as to minimize the storage capacity of the memory (60). (Col. 6, lines 50-52; and Col. 8, lines 53-56). Thus, *Wasilewski* teaches that the system key and the broadcast key are sequences of information bits stored at both the transmission and reception terminals and used in encrypting and decrypting transmitted data, rather than being signals entered by a user at the transmitting terminal for directing the transmission of image data to a remote location, as claim 1 would require. Applicant would respectfully disagree with the Examiner's position that a person of ordinary skill in the art would find it obvious to combine the above teaching of *Wasilewski* with those of *Kotani.*

The encryption keys are also simply sequences of information bits. Because the encryption keys are generated by the transmission terminal from the system and broadcast keys, they cannot correspond to the user inputted transmission signals of the present invention, as asserted by the Examiner. That is, there is no suggestion that the encryption keys of *Wasilewski* can be considered as a user input at the transmission site. Further, there is no disclosure or suggestion in *Wasilewski* of the transmission terminal having a function selection panel with a multiple keypad for the entering of transmission signals by a user. Therefore, the secondary reference, *Wasilewski*, fails to overcome the deficiencies of *Kotani.* Even if the teachings of *Kotani* and *Wasilewski et al.* were combined, the combination would not result in the claimed invention.

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 1, as well as dependant claims 2-14, patentably distinguish the invention over the applied references, whether taken individually or in combination.

Claims 15 and 18 are independent system and method claims, which include limitations similar those of claim 1. Therefore, it is submitted that independent claims 15 and 18, as well as their respective dependant claims 16-17 and 19-20, are patentable over the applied references for at least the same reasons that independent claim 1 is patentable. As such, the rejection of all the pending claims should be withdrawn.

Further, it is respectfully submitted that the dependant claims recite features that independently distinguish over the applied art references. For example, *Wasilewski* fails to disclose or suggest "a display panel for displaying the contents inputted through the multiple keypad and a status of image signal transmission", as claims 17 and 20 require.

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully requested that this application, with claims 1-20, be allowed, and that the rejections be withdrawn. Notice of such allowance and passing of the application to issue, are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner feel that a conference would be helpful in expediting the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is hereby invited to contact the undersigned counsel to arrange for such an interview.

Respectfully submitted,

December 8, 2004
Date

Phillip G. Avruch
Registration No. 46,076
RABIN & BERDO, P.C.
1101 14th Street, N. W., Suite 500
Washington, D. C. 20005
Tel: (202) 371-8976
Fax: (202) 408-0924
E-mail: firm@rabinchamp.com

PGA/pjl